

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/519,421	10/24/2005	Philippe Meyer	15675P564	7558	
8791	7590 08/07/2006		EXAMINER		
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN			LIN, KUANG Y		
12400 WILS SEVENTH	SHIRE BOULEVARD FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LOS ANGE	LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030		1725		
			DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006	DATE MAILED: 08/07/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		S		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/519,421	MEYER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Kuang Y. Lin	1725		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versillure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/20	<u>0/04 & 10/24/05</u> .			
·	action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	:x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	03 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	ır.			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the $\mathfrak k$	Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents 2.□ Certified copies of the priority documents 3.□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____

Application/Control Number: 10/519,421 Page 2

Art Unit: 1725

1. Applicant is requested to provide in the specification headings, such as "BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION", "SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION", "BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS", "DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS", etc. to render the specification in a better format.

- 2. The specification is objected to under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph in that in page 7, line 20, the word "rod" is misspelled. In page 8, line 23, it recites the "arrows Fc". However, it is not clear what is referred to. Line 30, it recites "shoulder B". What material is used for making the same? In page 9, lines 7-12, the language is written in a non-idiomatic manner such that render the meaning vague and indefinite. Applicant is required to correct these and other errors which might occur throughout the specification.
- 3. Claims 7-11 and 18-23 are objected to in that they involve an improper multiple dependent claim format. A multiple dependent claim can not depend from a multiple dependent claim.
- 4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed language of "such as" (claim 1, lines 2 and 8 and claim 12, lines 2 and 9) is deemed to be indefinite since it is not sure what scope is claimed. In claim 1, lines 5-9 and claim 12, lines 6-10, they are written in a non-idiomatic manner such that render the meaning vague and indefinite. Further, claim 1, line 11, the meaning of "lined with its liquid alloy core" is not clear. In claims 4 and

Application/Control Number: 10/519,421 Page 3

Art Unit: 1725

15, it recites "shoulder". It is not clear what material is used to make the same. In claim 12, line 5, what "metal shell" is referred? Line 13, what is "risering"? In claim 17, there is a lack of antecedent in the claim for "**the** cooling units". In claim 23, what "mold shell" is referred to?

- 5. Claims 7-11 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 USC 112, 4th paragraph as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.
 - Claims 7-11 and 20-23 (process claims) involve structure limitation, rather than process step, in a method claim while claims 18 and 19 (apparatus claims) involve process step, rather than structural limitation, in an apparatus claim. Thus, they do not further limitation the scope of the claim from which they depend.
- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

Art Unit: 1725

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Page 4

8. Claims 1-23 insofar as definite are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shade.

Shade substantially shows the invention as claimed except that he does not disclose to feeding the mold by gravity. However, in col. 11, first few lines of Shade he states that the opening for molten metal may be located at parting line SL (see figure 4). The location is similar to the instant application (see figure 5). Thus, it is apparent that Shade also feeds the mold by gravity. With respect to claims 2 and 3, US 2003/0000677 to Goya Arcelus et al. show that feature to be conventional. With respect to claim 4, Shade also provide core 22 (shoulder). With respect to claims 5, 7, 8, etc., the specific arrangement of the segments and the sequence of assembling the core and cooling unit depends on the designated casting structure to be obtained. It would have been obvious for those of ordinary skill in the casting to properly arrange the segments such that to obtain the designated final cast product. With respect to claim 10 and 12, the cover core 24 of Shade is the area of riser or a "risering".

- 9. The patents to Legge et al. and Buchborn are cited to further show the state of the art.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-1179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

Application/Control Number: 10/519,421 Page 5

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick J. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or £71-272-1000.

Kuang Y. Lin Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725